

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

IN RE: AQUEOUS FILM-FORMING FOAMS PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	MDL No.: 2873 Master Docket No.: 2:18-mn-2873-RMG
	This Document Relates to: <i>Joel Humphrey et al v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03754-RMG; <i>Jeffrey Bulick et al v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03807-RMG; <i>John Coppa v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03808-RMG; <i>Thomas Kehoe v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03809-RMG; <i>Joseph Romagnoli et al v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03810-RMG; <i>Ty Buffington v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03832-RMG; <i>Donald Williams et al v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03908-RMG; <i>Bressman et al v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03968-RMG; <i>Pelyak v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03969-RMG; <i>Boudalis v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03972-RMG; <i>Weiner et al v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-03981-RMG; <i>Eugene Bowerman et al v. 3M Company et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04008-RMG; <i>White et al v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04106-RMG; <i>Rosemarie Love v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04107-RMG;

	<i>Ronald Carestia et al v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04109-RMG;
	<i>Kevin Kromminga v. 3M Company et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04111-RMG;
	<i>Richard Wernick et al v. 3M Company et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04162-RMG;
	<i>Louis Zimmerman v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04185-RMG;
	<i>Robert Trump v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04219-RMG;
	<i>Linda Molek v. 3M Company et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04220-RMG;
	<i>Dipesh Sharma v. 3M Company et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04231-RMG;
	<i>Matthew McHale v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04433-RMG;
	<i>Martin Burg v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04466-RMG;
	<i>John Gnapp v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04467-RMG;
	<i>James Wierzbicky et al v. 3M Company, The et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04481-RMG;
	<i>Victor Myers v. 3M Company et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04500-RMG;
	<i>David Perea v. 3M Company et al,</i> 2:22-cv-04502-RMG

**NOTICE OF DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE PURSUANT TO
FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 41(a)(1)(A)(i)**

Plaintiffs in the above-captioned action initiated the above-captioned actions by filing Complaints against defendants, including Daikin America, Inc. Defendant Daikin America, Inc. has not answered, moved, or otherwise responded to these Complaints. Pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs hereby dismiss the above-captioned actions against Daikin America, Inc., only, without prejudice, each party to bear its own

costs and fees. Plaintiffs reserve their rights against all other Defendants named in each respective action.

Dated: May 31, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Chelsie L. Green

Chelsie L. Green, Esq.
Madeline E. Pendley, Esq.
Wesley A. Bowden, Esq.
M. Justin Lusko, Esq.
**Levin, Papantonio, Rafferty, Proctor,
Buchanan, O'Brien, Barr & Mougey, P.A.**
316 South Baylen Street, Suite 600
Pensacola, Florida 32502
cgreen@levinlaw.com
mpendley@levinlaw.com
wbowden@levinlaw.com
P: (850) 435-7075 / F: (850) 436-6075
Counsel for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on May 31, 2023, a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically using the Court's Case Management/Electronic Case Filings System (CM/ECF). Notice of and access to this filing will be provided to all parties through CM/ECF.

/s/ Chelsie L. Green
Chelsie L. Green